



**The Secretary of Energy**  
Washington, DC 20585

November 8, 1993

The Honorable John T. Conway  
Chairman  
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board  
625 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mr. Conway:

On June 16, 1993, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board transmitted to the Department of Energy Recommendation 93-4, which addresses health and safety factors associated with the Fernald Environmental Management Project and the management and oversight of environmental restoration contracts. On August 6, 1993, the Department accepted the Recommendation.

Enclosed is the Implementation Plan for Recommendation 93-4, in accordance with 42 U.S.C. 2286d(e). As specified in the Plan, the Department will keep the Board apprised of our progress by providing the documentation associated with the deliverables for each action specified in the plan as they are completed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Hazel R. O'Leary".

Hazel R. O'Leary

Enclosure

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES  
SAFETY BOARD RECOMMENDATION 93-4

I. Introduction

The purpose of the Implementation Plan is to outline the steps to be taken in response to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) Recommendation 93-4 relating to how the Department of Energy (DOE) will ensure adequate protection of the health and safety of the public, on-site workers involved in the cleanup of sites, and the environment.

This plan will encompass the DOE facilities that currently or will have Environmental Restoration Management Contractors (ERMCs) performing restoration-type activities. ERMC activities include those currently under the purview of the Fernald Field Office and the Richland Operations Office.

Weaknesses have been identified in DOE's technical direction of contractor performance, including contractor implementation of conduct of operations and the level of knowledge and technical competency of contractor, field office, and headquarters personnel. This plan will consist of six actions that were identified in the Secretary's letter of acceptance of Recommendation 93-4. The plan will address environmental restoration management activities that are contractor specific, complex wide, and Fernald specific.

II. DOE Response to Recommendation 93-4

The implementation of this recommendation will provide a cohesive approach to the activities necessary to ensure the safety of the public and on-site workers at DOE facilities and sites involved in environmental restoration. This structured approach will allow for:

- timely identification and commitment of adequate technical resources to manage contracts and projects;
- up front identification for DOE technical managers of expectations deriving from DOE's responsibilities for protection of health and safety of workers and the public; and
- assurance that DOE's technical line management and safety oversight organizations are involved in the contracting process.

This section has been divided into seven actions. The first six correspond to the DNFSB recommendations accepted in the Secretary's August 6, 1993, letter. The seventh action is to provide a quarterly status report to the DNFSB. Several of these actions have been initiated and are proceeding based on schedules resulting from other DNFSB Recommendations or DOE initiatives. To implement Recommendation 3 of

DNFSB Recommendation 93-4, we are making use of several activities already in progress, namely the Contract Reform Team sponsored by the Secretary and the task force revising DOE Order 4700.1, Project Management System. To help track the status of the activities in the Implementation Plan, a matrix, included as Attachment C, will be updated in the quarterly status report and includes points of contact for further clarification. The Fernald Field Office will be responsible for implementing the requirements of the Implementation Plan for activities at the Fernald site, with the Office of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management as the Cognizant Secretarial Officer. The actions are addressed as follows:

A. Recommendation 1

1. Stated Recommendation

***DOE develop and implement a technical management plan for Fernald and all future ERMC contracts. For Fernald, the technical management plan should be developed and implemented expeditiously. For future ERMC contracts, such a plan should be readied prior to contractor selection, and should be implemented at the initiation of contracted services.***

2. Course of Action

The Department will develop and implement a technical management plan for Fernald and future ERMC contracts. The technical management plan for Fernald is currently being developed and will be implemented in an expeditious manner since the contractor is already performing. The technical management plan for Hanford is also currently in development and will be in place prior to completion of transition to the ERMC to allow for a timely implementation. For application to future ERMC contracts, a generic technical management plan will be developed prior to contractor selection. The generic technical management plan will be made available for consideration by the task force rewriting DOE Order 4700.1 as part of the project management plan specified in that Order.

The following steps will be taken to complete this action:

- (1) A Technical Management Plan will be developed for Fernald by:
  - a. reviewing the Environmental Restoration Program, EM-40 Management Plan (DOE/EM/RM/02), and the Project Management Plan outline from DOE Order 4700.1 Project Management System to develop a model for the Technical Management Plan;
  - b. establishing an outline of contents for the Technical Management Plan; and
  - c. identifying qualified key personnel at the DOE Fernald Field Office and Headquarters for technical direction, monitoring, and oversight of contractor performance for inclusion in the Technical Management Plan, including necessary training to meet current performance expectations.

- (2) A Technical Management Plan for Hanford will be developed.
- (3) The initial compliance of Fernald with the Technical Management Plan will be assessed by the Fernald Environmental Management Project Division, Office of Eastern Area Programs, Office of Environmental Restoration; a corrective action/implementation plan, including the schedule, will be developed as required by the Fernald Field Office.
- (4) A generic Technical Management Plan will be developed for future contracts by the Office of Environmental Restoration.
- (5) Interface with and provide input for rewriting of DOE Order 4700.1 Project Management System to incorporate the requirements for implementation of a technical management plan.

### 3. Deliverables/Milestones

This action will generate the following deliverables at the dates shown:

- |  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| a. Outline of Technical Management Plan  | November 15, 1993             |
| b. Technical Management Plan for Fernald, including identification of key personnel and training needs | December 18, 1993             |
| c. Technical Management Plan for Hanford   | January 18, 1994 <sup>1</sup> |
| d. Complete initial assessment of Fernald and document results   | March 30, 1994                |
| e. Generic Technical Management Plan   | December 18, 1993             |
| f. Submit Technical Management Plan to DOE Order 4700.1 revision task force                            | January 15, 1994              |

### B. Recommendation 2

#### 1. Stated Recommendation

***Each plan for technical management of contracted services include as a minimum:***

---

<sup>1</sup> This date is dependent upon the award of the ERMC contract at Hanford. Document to be complete prior to ERMC assumption of activities. This Technical Management Plan may be revised based upon completion of the systems engineering approach for site-wide activities being conducted as part of Recommendation 92-4 Implementation Plan currently due June 30, 1994.

- a. **a clear statement of functions and responsibilities of those in DOE assigned the task of technical direction, monitoring, or oversight of the contracted efforts, both at headquarters and the relevant operations offices;**
- b. **definition of the technical and managerial qualifications required of DOE's technical management staff at each level of responsible DOE line and oversight units;**
- c. **identification of the principal interfaces with the non-technical DOE personnel involved in the contract management;**
- d. **identification, by name, of the key technical personnel selected to perform the requisite technical direction, monitoring, and oversight functions;**
- e. **identification of policies, practices, orders, and other key instructions that represent a basic framework to be used in DOE technical management of the contractor in ensuring public and worker safety and adequate environmental protection; and**
- f. **a detailed program to ensure compliance with applicable statutes and DOE Orders, standards, rules, directives, and other requirements related to public and worker safety and environmental protection.**

## 2. Course of Action

The technical management plan will include all of the above stated elements identified by the DNFSB and as discussed in the previous action.

## 3. Deliverables/Milestones

This action will generate no additional deliverables other than those identified in Recommendation 1.

## C. Recommendation 3

### 1. Stated Recommendation

**DOE consider the insights gained from addressing recommendations 1 and 2 above for ERM contracts in pursuing the broader initiatives for reforming contract management you recently announced.**

### 2. Course of Action

DOE will include those insights gained as a result of addressing Recommendations 1 and 2 in our planned review of contracting mechanisms and practices.

There are teams currently evaluating aspects of contracting mechanisms and technical management plans that apply directly to this recommendation. The first is a team sponsored by the Secretary on Contract Reform. The second is a task force to rewrite DOE Order 4700.1, Project Management System (additional discussion is included in Recommendation 1).

The Contract Reform Team is chaired by the Deputy Secretary. The Team is comprised of 17 principal members and their alternates, of which 14 are DOE personnel and three are from the Office of Management and Budget. The purpose of the Team is to conduct a top-to-bottom review of the Department's contracting mechanisms and practices and to recommend specific administrative, financial, and legislative improvements to contracting mechanisms and practices that will increase accountability, stimulate competition, and simplify administration. A final report is due by December 31, 1993. A Stakeholder meeting was held in Washington, D.C., on September 23, 1993, which was one of nine scheduled around the country. Testimony (oral and written) was given by members of the public on ways to improve specific contracts, including environmental restoration management and management and operating contracts. More information on this Team is included in Attachment A.

The team to revise DOE Order 4700.1 is being chaired by the Office of Field Management and is organized as a Process Improvement Team. The Process Improvement Team will consist of 10-12 members with representatives from Headquarters, field elements, and contractors. The Process Improvement Team will compile all the relevant issues, conduct a comprehensive review of the project management system, and develop a strategy for resolution. The Process Improvement Team will then rewrite the current order into a 15-20 page "summary level" policy order and identify areas requiring supplemental flow-down guidance. The Office of Field Management will then develop subsequent flow-down functional manuals to supplement the summary level policy of the order. Examples of areas requiring flow down guidance are: 1) project control system; 2) key decision review and approval; 3) configuration/baseline management; 4) project management certification; and 5) systems engineering and analysis requirements. DOE Order 4700.1 will be revised and submitted for formal coordination by May 31, 1994. The supplementary manuals for the revised Order will be developed and are scheduled to be approved by April 30, 1995, depending upon the extent of the manuals required. These dates are tentative due to the moratorium on revisions to orders and directives and assumes a start date of November 1, 1993. The process to officially identify the Process Improvement Team will be initiated after the moratorium is lifted. More information on the Process Improvement Team is included in Attachment B.

Both the Teams have been contacted and will consider inclusion of the applicable parts of DNFSB Recommendation 93-4 as part of their actions. However, the results of either Team activities will not affect the Fernald site Technical Management Plan content as it

addresses specific parts of DNFSB Recommendation 93-4. The Team contacts have been added to the status reports currently being generated during the implementation of this recommendation. The following steps will be taken to complete this action:

- a. interface with the teams during preparation of the technical management plans;
  - b. present completed technical management plans to the teams;
  - c. work with the teams to incorporate lessons learned from this process into their activities; and
  - d. provide copies of team reports to the DNFSB.
3. Deliverables/Milestones

Copies of team reports will be provided to the DNFSB when they are available. Reports are scheduled for completion as indicated.

- a. Contract Reform Team final report    December 31, 1993
- b. Revised DOE Order 4700.1                May 31, 1994

D. Recommendation 4

1. Stated Recommendation

***DOE headquarters complete an independent review of the recent incidents at Fernald, identifying the root causes for those incident, and the corrective actions required to remedy the underlying problems, and translate the Fernald findings into lessons learned applicable to other facilities.***

2. Course of Action

DOE Headquarters will conduct an independent review of the corrective actions taken subsequent to the recent incidents (misroute and spill of uranyl nitrate hexahydrate (UNH)) at Fernald, of the root causes, and will communicate lessons learned to other DOE facilities, as appropriate. The corrective actions and root causes detailed in the Type B Investigation Report will be the basis for the independent review. The following steps will be taken to complete this action:

- a. The Office of Environment, Safety and Health will complete their review of the Type B Investigation;
- b. The Deputy Office Director, Office of Eastern Area Programs, Office of Environmental Restoration, will lead the independent assessment;

- c. The Fernald site will be assessed on how they are addressing the corrective actions recommended in the Type B Investigation;
- d. The assessment and recommendations for Fernald will be documented; and
- e. The corrective action plan will be developed and monitored.

### 3. Deliverables/Milestones

This action will generate the following deliverables at the dates shown:

- a. Initiate assessment November 8, 1993
- b. Submit assessment report to Fernald and DNFSB December 18, 1993

## E. Recommendation 5

### 1. Stated Recommendation

***DOE establish a clear process with an appropriate set of requirements and clear definitions of the line authority for approval to start the UNH stabilization project. The set of requirements should identify the type and scope of readiness reviews DOE will require for the start of the UNH stabilization runs. For the type and scope of the reviews, consideration should be given to the standards set forth in previous Board recommendations on this subject (i.e. 90-4, 91-3, 91-4, 92-1, 92-3, and 92-6) and account for the known safety considerations for this operation. This process should also include identification of the appropriate DOE Official(s) responsible for ensuring that public and worker health and safety are adequately protected and for giving final start-up approval.***

### 2. Course of Action

Formalize a clear process and line of authority for restart of the UNH Stabilization Project. The process for ensuring readiness to start-up is being prepared and a study to ensure the tank integrity is adequate to ensure worker, public, and environmental safety and health is in progress, due to the protracted time expected before restart of the process.

The following steps will be taken to complete this action:

- a. develop a restart procedure based on the new DOE Order 5480.31 and Operational Readiness Review Standard. This procedure will define the set of requirements to identify the type and scope of readiness reviews. It will also establish the line of authority for safe start-up of operations, including the final start-up approval;



- b. complete a study of integrity of UNH tanks and, as appropriate, factor those results into the start-up procedure and schedule; and
- c. obtain approval from the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management for restart of the UNH Process.

### 3. Deliverables/Milestones

This action will generate the following deliverables at the dates shown:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| a. Restart procedure   | December 31, 1993                        |
| b. Review tank integrity report                              | March 31, 1994                           |
| c. Receive approval for restart from the Assistant Secretary | Upon completion of start-up requirements |

## F. Recommendation 6

### 1. Stated Recommendation

***DOE immediately establish a group of technically qualified Facility Representatives at Fernald to monitor the ongoing activities of daily operations at the site. DOE's "Guidelines for Establishing and Maintaining a Facility Representative Program at DOE Nuclear Facilities," issued in March, 1993, may be a useful basis for quickly establishing such a program at Fernald.***

### 2. Course of Action

DOE will accelerate ongoing efforts to fully implement the Facility Representative Program at Fernald in accordance with the Action Plan for DNFSB Recommendation 92-2.

As part of acceleration of the facility representative program, the Fernald Field Office has identified and dedicated four personnel to the program based on experience and performance (Letter DOE-2470-93, dated July 20, 1993, and Letter DOE-2545-93, dated July 30, 1993). The Fernald site is not an operating facility and the only identified controlled area is the Boiler Plant. Therefore, the personnel have been assigned based on current activity/process requirements as opposed to being assigned to specific facilities, except for the Boiler Plant. The personnel identified and their assignments are as follows:

Doug Maynor	Plant 2/3 (UNH Restart), Plant 8 (Restart)
Bill Lancaster	Safe Shutdown
Gordon Brown	Plant 9 (Minimum Additive Waste Stabilization)
Richard Farr	Building 10A (Boiler Plant), Plant 1 (Ore Silos)

These assignments are based on an analysis of the activities and operations ongoing at the site and may be modified based on safety concerns and lessons learned from other sites.

In addition, five personnel requisitions have been submitted to DOE Headquarters for the hiring of permanent facility representatives. These positions are considered critical hires.

Facility Representative activities are being conducted in conjunction with the actions identified in the Implementation and Action Plans for DNFSB Recommendation 92-2. This group reports to the Assistant Manager for Environmental Restoration Support, who in turn reports to the Field Office Manager. This group has been assigned responsibility to institute a facility representative program.

The Fernald Field Office Manager has provisionally qualified the facility representatives based on the following criteria: General Employee Training, Radiation Worker II Training, Site Worker Training, respirator fit training at Fernald, their prior job experience, and their education. The training plans for these personnel shall be modified to reflect the training needed for qualification and certification as a Facility Representative.

Additional training for qualifying the personnel listed above occurred by attendance at a 1-week training course on Performance-Based Inspection conducted at Fernald during the week of September 20-24, 1993. The final Fernald specific facility representative training and qualification procedures will be approved by February 15, 1993.

The following steps will be taken to complete this action:

- a. continue training and implementation of the proposed requirements for the Facility Representative Program as they are developed; and
- b. develop program for Fernald Facility Representatives, which will include training and qualifications, using elements generated from DNFSB Recommendations.

### 3. Deliverables/Milestones

This action will generate the following deliverables at the date shown:

- |  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| a. Interim Fernald Facility Representative Program, which will include training and qualification requirements | October 31, 1993<br>(Complete) |
| b. Final Fernald Facility Representative Program, which will include training and qualification requirements   | February 15, 1994              |
| c. Fully qualify Facility Representatives  | October 31, 1994               |

for Fernald

G. DOE Initiative 1

Submit quarterly status reports from EM-1 to DNFSB. The target for transmittal of the quarterly status report will be 15 days within the end of the quarter. The initial report will be issued January 1994.

## CONTRACT REFORM COMMITTEE

Introduction

The Secretary of Energy, in her May 26, 1993, testimony before the House Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, acknowledged that the Department had fundamental weaknesses in its contractor management of such significance that the very nature of DOE's contracting must change. She concluded that the essence of the problem is that "DOE is not adequately in control of its contractors and as a result the contractors are not sufficiently accountable to the Department." The Secretary committed the Department to aggressively changing its approach to contracting to ensure that:

- (1) clear expectations for contractor performance and meaningful measurement criteria to assess performance exits;
- (2) financial accountability and the efficient use of taxpayer dollars are achieved;
- (3) sufficient trained Federal staff exist to monitor contractor performance;
- (4) systems are implemented which properly hold a contractor accountable for misconduct; and
- (5) clear separation exists between Federal workers and contractor employees so that inherently governmental responsibilities are performed only by Federal employees.

The Secretary also announced a series of short- and long-term initiatives to improve contract management in the Department. The short-term initiatives are aimed at producing real cost savings of public funds and increasing fiscal responsibility. They are:

- (1) reduce the use of support services contracts by 10 percent in Fiscal Year 1994;
- (2) increase contractor accountability for civil penalties;
- (3) control contractor indirect costs;
- (4) freeze contractor salaries; and
- (5) improve DOE Acquisition Regulations.

The objectives of the long-term initiatives are to implement functional and structural improvements in the Department's contracting practices. They are:

- (1) establish a Contract Reform Team to review contracting mechanisms and practices;
- (2) implement a departmental realignment to improve contractor management;

- (3) work with organized labor to control contract costs;
- (4) examine the potential to increase the level of the Federal work force in exchange for reductions in contract funding; and
- (5) provide quality training to improve contract management.

### Contract Reform Team

#### Team Structure and Composition

The Team is chaired by the Deputy Secretary. The Team consists of 17 principal members and their alternates, of which 14 are DOE personnel and three are from the Office of Management and Budget. The listing of personnel on the Team is on the last page of this attachment.

The purpose of the Team is to conduct a top-to-bottom review of DOE's contracting mechanisms and practices and to recommend specific administrative, financial, and legislative improvements to contracting mechanisms and practices that will increase accountability, stimulate competition, and simplify administration.

#### Approach to Analysis

The Team identified nine major issue areas for detailed examination. Certain Team members were assigned lead responsibility to analyze the issues and develop recommendations. These nine areas and the Responsible Team Members are:

<u>Issue Areas</u>	<u>Responsible Team Members</u>
Performance Criteria and Measures	William White
Competition/Extension Policy	William White
Non-Profit Contractors	Donald Pearman
Indirect Costs	Thomas Grumbly
Indemnification of Contractors	Robert Nordhaus
Financial Management	Elizabeth Smedley
Federal Oversight of Contractors	Archer Durham
Use of Support Services	Archer Durham
Litigation and Outside Counsel Fees	Robert Nordhaus

Working Groups, consisting of individuals with multi-disciplined technical and administrative skills and backgrounds, were established for each issue area. Each Working Group is responsible for identifying areas of investigation related to the specific issue, developing an analytical approach and schedule, and preparing a final report detailing their findings and making specific recommendations. The recommendations of each Working Group will be assessed and prioritized by the Team and included in the Team's report to the Secretary.

The final report is scheduled to be provided on or before December 31, 1993.

**CONTRACT REFORM TEAM**

**William White, Deputy Secretary**  
**Dan Reicher, Office of the Secretary**  
**David Hepner, Office of the Secretary**  
**Victor Reis, Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs**  
**Donald Pearman, Associate Deputy Secretary for Field Management**  
**Robert Nordhaus, General Counsel**  
**Archer Durham, Assistant Secretary for Human Resources and Administration**  
**Thomas Grumbly, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management**  
**Jim Decker, Principal Deputy Director, Office of Energy Research**  
**Sue Tierney, Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Program Evaluation**  
**Jack Siegel, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy**  
**Elizabeth Smedley, Chief Financial Officer**  
**Robert San Martin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy**  
**Stan Kaufman, Office of Federal Procurement Policy**  
**Gary Bennethum, Office of Management and Budget**  
**Jack Sheehan, Office of Federal Financial Management**  
**Augie Pitrolo, Manager, Idaho Operations Office**

DOE ORDER 4700.1, PROJECT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PROCESS IMPROVEMENT TEAM

Objective:

To assure the application of sound management principles in achieving and sustaining a flexible, cost-effective project management system to meet the mission needs of DOE. The revised order will foster project management systems that decentralize management authority and minimize procedural requirements to facilitate control and execution of projects within the DOE.

Requirements:

The project management system, as a minimum, shall establish summary level policy for the following:

1. Management Roles, Responsibilities, and Authority
2. Project Initiation and Planning Documentation
3. Project Budget Process
4. Cost and Contingency Estimating
5. Project Acquisition for all projects
6. Environmental Planning and Review
7. Project Transition
8. Change Control
9. System Engineering, Test, and Evaluation
10. Configuration Management
11. Quality Assurance
12. Project Control System
13. Project Termination
14. Project Status Review
15. Project Reporting and Assessment
16. Baseline Management to Total Project Cost
17. Project Manager Certification

This Order prescribes policies and procedures for implementing a project management system to plan, oversee, and execute DOE projects. It will direct a cost-effective, graded approach to application of project management, providing flexibility in the application to all projects on the basis of scale, type, and unique needs of each project. A standardized approach for implementation of the project management system is not given in order that the field has maximum flexibility to implement the intent of the Order.

DOE Program Offices, Operations Offices, and contractors shall meet all the requirements of the revised order within 6 months from the date of issuance.

The tentative plan of action for development of the revised order is to issue notification to the field to identify specific issues and assemble a Process Improvement Team. The Process Improvement Team will consist of 10-12 members with representatives from Headquarters, field elements, and contractors. The Office of Field Management will lead the Process Improvement Team. The members of the Process Improvement Team have not been determined.

The Process Improvement Team will compile all the relevant issues, conduct a comprehensive review of the project management system, and develop a strategy for resolution. The Process Improvement Team will then rewrite the current Order into a 15-20 page "summary level" policy order and identify areas requiring supplemental flow down guidance.

The Office of Field Management will then develop subsequent flow-down functional manuals to supplement the summary level policy of the Order. Examples of areas requiring flow-down guidance are: 1) project control system; 2) key decision review and approval; 3) configuration/baseline management; 4) project management certification; and 5) systems engineering and analysis requirements.

DOE Order 4700.1 will be revised and submitted for formal coordination by May 31, 1994. The supplementary manuals for the revised Order will be developed and is currently scheduled to be approved by April 30, 1995, depending upon the extent of the manuals required. (This schedule is based upon the original schedule that has been delayed due to the moratorium on directives and assumes a start date of November 1, 1993, for issuance of the letter requesting the field to identify the specific issues.)

The revised Order will address and resolve key issues such as:

- (1) clarification of project management policies, including any necessary changes to existing policies;
- (2) identify and clarify program and project management responsibilities;
- (3) promote decentralization where feasible to improve efficiency and cost effectiveness;
- (4) project definition--the revised Order will provide a clear definition of a DOE "project" to ensure that all applicable activities, not only traditional construction projects, are subject to the requirements of the revised Order;
- (5) Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Projects--the revised Order will address the requirements of the environmental project, including key decisions, baselining, and management systems to accommodate the unique nature of environmental remedial action projects; and
- (6) Energy System Acquisition Advisory Board, Budget Validation, and Project Documentation Processes--the revised Order will consider re-engineering of these and similar processes as necessary to achieve efficiencies and improvements.



## ACTION TRACKING DNFSB RECOMMENDATION 93-4 Attachment C

Item Number	Description	Deliverable	Milestone	Assignee	Status
934.IP.1	Prepare Draft Implementation Plan	Draft Implementation Plan	September 30, 1993	Susan Peterman 301-903-7633 or 513-648-3135	Completed.
934.IP.2	EM Provide Draft Implementation Plan to DNFSB	Implementation Plan	September 30, 1993	Dave Kozlowski 301-903-8160	Completed.
934.IP.3	DNFSB Staff Comments on Implementation Plan		October 15, 1993	DNFSB	Completed.
934.IP.4	Begin concurrence process		October 22, 1993	Dave Kozlowski 301-903-8160	Completed.
934.IP.5	Submit IP to Executive Secretary for Secretary's signature		October 29, 1993	Dave Kozlowski 301-903-8160	Completed.
934.IP.6	Submit IP to Board		November 5, 1993	Dave Kozlowski 301-903-8160	

Item Number	Description	Deliverable	Milestone	Assignee	Status
934.A.2.(1)	A Technical Management Plan will be developed for Fernald	Technical Management Plan for Fernald	December 18, 1993	Susan Peterman 513-648-3135	Initiated
934.A.2.(1).a	Reviewing the Environmental Restoration Program, EM-40 Management Plan (DOE/EM/RM/02) and Project Management Plan outline from DOE Order 4700.1 Project Management System to develop model for Technical Management Plan		November 15, 1993	Susan Peterman 513-648-3135	In process, several outlines generated for comparison.
934.A.2.(1).b	Establishing an outline of contents for the Technical Management Plan	Outline of Technical Management Plan	November 15, 1993	Susan Peterman 513-648-3135	In process, several outlines generated for applicability.
934.A.2.(1).c	Identifying qualified key personnel at DOE Fernald Field Office and Headquarters for technical direction, monitoring, and oversight of contractor performance for inclusion in the Technical Management Plan including necessary training to meet current performance expectations		December 18, 1993		
934.A.2.(2)	A Technical Management Plan for Hanford will be developed	Technical Management Plan for Hanford	January 18, 1994	Roger Freeburg 509-376-6628	Initiated

Item Number	Description	Deliverable	Milestone	Assignee	Status
934.A.2.(3)	Assess initial compliance of Fernald with the Technical Management Plan; and develop corrective action/implementation plan including schedule, as required	Submit documented results of assessment	March 30, 1994	Team	
934.A.2.(4)	A generic Technical Management Plan will be developed for future contracts	Generic Technical Management Plan	December 18, 1993	EM-43/Owen Robertson 301-903-8168	
934.A.2.(5)	Interface with and provide input for rewriting of DOE Order 4700.1 Project Management System to incorporate the requirements for implementation of a technical management plan		As required.	Mary McCune 301-903-8152	
934.C.2.a	Interface with the committees during preparation of the technical management plans.		As required.		
934.C.2.b	Present completed technical management plans to the committees.		January 15, 1993	Mary McCune 301-903-8152	
934.C.2.c	Work with the committees to incorporate lessons learned from this process into their activities.		As required.	Mary McCune 301-903-8152	

Item Number	Description	Deliverable	Milestone	Assignee	Status
934.C.2.d	Copies of committee reports will be provided to the DNFSB.	Contract Reform Team final report Revised DOE Order 4700.1	December 31, 1993 May 31, 1994	Mary McCune 301-903-8152	
934.D.2.a	EH will complete their review of the Type B investigation	Comments on Type B Investigation	October 15, 1993	Prakash Conjere 301-903-2443	Completed.
934.D.2.b	the EM-42 Deputy Office Director will lead the independent assessment	Initiate assessment	November 8, 1993	EM-42 Deputy Office Director 301-903-7216	
934.D.2.c	the Fernald site will be assessed on how they are addressing the corrective actions recommended in the Type B Investigation				
934.D.2.d	the assessment and recommendations for Fernald will be documented	Submit assessment	December 18, 1993	EM-42 Deputy Office Director 301-907-7216	
934.D.2.e	the corrective action plan will be developed and monitored		As required.	Mary McCune 301-903-8152	

Item Number	Description	Deliverable	Milestone	Assignee	Status
934.E.2.a	DOE will develop a restart procedure based on revised DOE Order 5480.31 and Operational Readiness Review Standard.	Restart procedure	December 31, 1993	Bud Kehew 513-648-3126	Investigating requirements of new DOE Order
934.E.2.b	Complete a study on tank integrity of UNH tanks and, as appropriate, factor those results into the start-up procedure and schedule.	Tank Integrity Study	March 31, 1994	Bud Kehew 513-648-3126	Study initiated
934.E.2.c	Obtain approval by Assistant Secretary for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management for restart of the UNH process	Approval to restart	Upon completion of restart procedure	Bud Kehew 513-648-3126	
934.F.2.a	Continue training and implementation of the proposed requirements for the Facility Representative Program as they are developed	Fully qualified Facility Representatives for Fernald	October 31, 1994	Ray Hansen 513-648-3119	In process
934.F.2.b	Develop procedure for Fernald Facility Representative program and training and qualification	Fernald Facility Representative Program and training and qualification procedure	February 15, 1994	Doug Maynor 513-648-3173	In process
934.G	Submit quarterly status reports	Quarterly Status Reports	Issue 15 days after close of quarter; initial report January 15, 1994	Dave Kozlowski 301-903-8160	